

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3223

in a world where individual freedom must be tempered with sensitivity and concern for others, where international competition must be regulated by international understanding, where individual ambition must be moderated by respect for the integrity and the various talents and abilities of others.

Furthermore, by extending the reach of higher education to a broader spectrum of society, we also are challenged to extend the scope of programs to provide improved social tools and cultural outlooks and to accommodate an increasing variety of vocational competencies. Such an education cannot be designed once and left to serve for all time. It requires constant vigilance, constant pruning, constant nourishing with new ideas.

The world is looking at American education, at the interrelationship between educational excellence, leadership, and production. Developing nations have found our experiences with land-grant colleges especially valuable in their own educational planning. Our collegiate pluralism is a mirror of our religious and cultural pluralism and answers the demand for variety in a free society. It is understandable that a world newly discovering its polycentric nature would look to the universal character of our educational opportunities with increasing attention.

For example, the Robbins report, which assesses England's higher education needs for the next decade, recommends ways to assure that "courses of higher education should be available to all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them and who wish to do so." In effect, the Robbins report rejects the highly selective admissions policies of British universities and proposes to broaden the base of higher education. This decision has important implications for us, especially in those American institutions where admissions requirements are based on strictly academic measures of ability. While the world is looking at our higher education, we ourselves need a constant reevaluation of its appropriateness for our needs. In this, you as individuals have a responsibility to take a vital part.

In my plea that you "get in there and pitch" for whatever community or national action we need to extend the reach of higher education and to keep its quality and appropriateness on an ever-upward climb, I do not wish to play Polonius, but I should like to inject a word of caution. In years to come, as age brings nostalgia, there may be temptations for you—as there have already been with me—to muse that higher education isn't the same as it used to be. But the world for which we are educating is not the same as it used to be either.

Your children and mine will live in a changing world and our educational system will need a world of change to meet their needs.

It is for you to meet and make these changes. The quantity and quality of new education can be left up to the State but only at great risk. The State has no choice but to conform its education, higher or primary, to a common ideal. Such conformity is in itself a handicap. Only by participation of private voluntary institutions such as King's College can we have the true and valuable diversity of high ideals our country deserves. This makes it incumbent on you as leaders of the intellect to support and participate in the growth of our education, public and private. Even the word "private" is subject to change since these institutions are truly, parapublic, serving a great public purpose under private leadership.

In this connection I hail the announcement of the ordinary of Pittsburgh, Bishop Wright, who has announced that the parochial schools of Pittsburgh will be open

to all children of low income without regard to their religious belief.

Surely such splendid innovations deserve your valued support and participation as part of the great new adventure in grace that is 20th century, Chris Flanigan.

With the accelerating rate of change already upon us, much that you have learned here at King's College will be subject to critical analysis as you pursue that freedom of inquiry which is the great scholastic vitality.

It will be up to you to determine what the abiding truths are. You and I live in the age of surging expectation and we will either move with the crest of understanding or founder in the undertow of fallacy unless we continue the course of constant reeducation.

More important than what you have learned is the momentum to keep on learning, the desire to understand yourself and your fellow man, and the will to add your bit to the forward thrust of humanity. The kind of higher education we have in tomorrow's world should be different from what we have today. It will be better to the extent that it serves tomorrow's world. It is your task to keep it always viable and adaptable to society's needs and yet straightforward in its task of preparing individuals for the future they will help to shape.

Let us return full circle to St. Thomas Aquinas. "Three things are necessary * * * to know what to believe; to know what to desire; to know what to do."

To this I would add the capstone, "To do the best one knows." You will change the world, for good or ill, the extent and direction depending upon how much you know and what you do with it. You can change higher education—or education in general—and thereby contribute to the effectiveness of the leavening agent by which the future becomes better than the past. You—and only you—can determine whether your educational candle burns brightly and your torch is held high and glowing against the darkness.

Congress Must Revise and Liberalize Our Immigration Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1964

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, is now considering legislation to revise and liberalize our present immigration laws. I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken by this Congress so that present inequities will be eliminated. Following is my statement to the committee concerning the bill I introduced:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am gratified that your committee is holding hearings on legislation to revise and liberalize our present immigration laws. Reform of our antiquated and unfair immigration laws is long overdue, so that we may better serve humanity and further the interests of equality, the obnoxious principle of national origin upon which our immigration system has been based since 1924 must be eliminated.

Our esteemed chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary introduced a bill, H.R. 7700, based upon the suggestions and wishes of our dearly beloved former President Kennedy;

President Johnson also has requested and urged this Congress to approve the bill. I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 7902, to show my strong support. Ever since coming to Congress, I have introduced bills calling for a complete overhaul and liberalization of our immigration and naturalization laws. The need for such action on the part of Congress is forcibly brought home to me almost daily; my congressional district is one which contains a large percentage of immigrants and new U.S. citizens; many pathetic letters reach me describing the heartache resulting from interminable separation of members of a family. Children are frustrated in their efforts to bring their parents here; relatives in many countries face a lifetime of waiting for their turn to be reached under our unfair quota system.

The task before your committee should be undertaken with compassion and forthrightness and the recognition of the fact that the proposed changes in our laws are reasonable and are demanded by existing circumstances. Our country became great under our earlier policy of unrestricted immigration. Those who sought refuge and freedom here contributed mightily of their brawn, their brains, and their loyalty; our Nation grew strong and prospered. The present quota system which is based on the place of birth or the racial origin of a human being has proved to be a blot upon our conscience as a Nation. We must acknowledge that birthplace and racial origin of a human being do not determine the quality or the level of a man's intellect, his moral character, or his qualifications for becoming a part of our Nation and our society.

The administration bill and my identical bill provide that our future total immigration quota will be divided, regardless of the immigrant's place of birth, into categories completely divorced from the concept of race, nationality, citizenship, or place of birth. A person's skill, or his relationship to a citizen in the United States or to an immigrant previously admitted to our country for permanent residence, will determine his inclusion in one of the categories listed. However, a large portion of the annual immigration quota will remain available for refugees and displaced persons so that we, as a nation, can serve humanity and help unfortunates. We shall also give those who wish to leave their homelands and seek opportunities here for themselves and their children, an opportunity to do so.

We are mindful of the sad situation which exists at present—when thousands of immigrant visas allocated under existing quotas are not used by certain nations, by immigrants born in those countries which we have favored. At the same time immigrants born in other countries—less favored by us, if we are honest enough to admit it and which have infinitesimal quotas—have to wait for permission to come here for periods of a 5 to 25 years. This is a shameful state of affairs and it must be brought to an end.

Under the new system the entire quota will be used in every 12-month period. The process of elimination of the national origins principle will continue for 5 years after enactment of the bill. We would have preferred that the old condemned system of national origins be wiped out immediately. However, we must recognize that such a drastic change, if imposed overnight, would create havoc with the administrative processes of immigration and visa issuance by our consulates spread all over the world. Thus it is proposed to cut 20 percent of our quota in each of the 5 years succeeding enactment of the bill, and place that number of visas in a pool to be operated under the new system. At the end of the 5-year period, the new system will be in full effect, and the administrators will have gained necessary

A3224

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 15

experience by that time through gradual use of the new system.

After the fifth year following enactment of the bill, all quota numbers would be drawn from a single worldwide quota of 164,532. Quota numbers would be allocated in the order of preference specified in amended section 203 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. That is, first call on the first 50 percent is given to persons whose admission, by virtue of their exceptional skill, training or education, would be especially advantageous to the United States; first call on the next 30 percent, plus any part of the first 50 percent not issued to the skilled specialists, is given to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, not eligible for nonquota status because they are over 21 years of age; first call on the remaining 20 percent, plus any part of the first 30 percent not taken by the first two classes, is given to spouses and children of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence; and any portion remaining is issued to other applicants, with percentage preferences to other relations of U.S. citizens and resident aliens, and then to certain classes of workers. Section 203 further provides that within each class, visas are issued in the order in which applied for—first come, first served. These preference provisions, which under present law determine only relative priority between nationals of the same country, will now determine priority between nationals of different countries throughout the world.

No country would be allowed to receive more than 10 percent of the quota numbers available in any year (including those from the quota reserve pool during the first 5 years, from the area's quota), with certain exceptions.

The bill contains many other necessary and helpful provisions. Among other things, it would grant nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens.

The United States and worthy people all over the world need this bill. It is our responsibility to approve and pass it so that we may prove to all mankind that we truly believe in the equality of all men and that we are ready to welcome persons to our great land on a fair and equitable basis and to discard the old laws which are based on racial prejudice and are unfairly discriminatory.

I urge your Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality to approve this important legislation. I look forward to the privilege of voting for it in our full Committee on the Judiciary. I shall do all in my power to secure its passage by the Congress, so that the changes can be brought about as soon as possible.

Flag Day**EXTENSION OF REMARKS****HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 8, 1964

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few years ago a representative of United Press International related to me an incident he had witnessed while on assignment in Puerto Rico, at which a group of demonstrators marched on a Flag Day observance and attempted to tear down the Stars and Stripes. At that time I expressed my grave concern at such action, and I wish to do so again, for my attention has been directed to a statement that the pledge of allegiance to the

U.S. flag has been discontinued in public schools. It is important for my colleagues to know of this, I am sure you will agree, and I therefore am inserting the following editorial from the Elks Bulletin, San Juan, P.R., Lodge No. 972:

FLAG DAY: A TRIBUTE TO OUR FLAG

June 14 is the day annually set aside as Flag Day to call attention to our national emblem, its purpose and significance, the ideals it represents, and the respect it commands. For God and country is the motto of Americans. It is inscribed on our schools and institutions in Continental United States. It is preached from our pulpits. It is instilled to the hearts of all school children in Continental United States and its possessions except in Puerto Rico. The local authorities discontinued, the pledge of allegiance to the U.S. flag at public schools. Flag Day this year has an added significance with communism trying to spread throughout the world. It is a day of rededication to the ideals and principles for which our national emblem stands. Proudly we identify ourselves in our allegiance to the flag at every meeting with our forefathers, who wrote their loyalty to these United States in toll and sacrifice, in blood on battlefield, stanchly following the Stars and Stripes into the jaws of death.

As we Elks are loyal to our God we are loyal to our country. The honor that we give to our Nation's flag is but the outward expression of the loyalty and devotion that is within our heart and soul which should be clearly demonstrated by every Elk and his family by being promptly at the lodge on Sunday, June 14 at 8 o'clock p.m. to witness and enjoy our beautiful and impressive Flag Day exercises.

THE EDITOR.

Resolution by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 11, 1964

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I would like to insert a resolution which has been passed by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia.

The resolution was introduced by Hon. Dan White, State representative of McIntosh County, which is located in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Representative White's resolution has reference to a project in McIntosh County which was made possible because of a loan from the Area Redevelopment Administration.

The resolution follows:

H. RES. 65

(By Mr. White, of McIntosh)

Resolution relative to the Area Redevelopment Administration; and for other purposes

"Whereas the Area Redevelopment Administration at the U.S. Department of Commerce, at the present time, has designated 77 counties in Georgia as eligible to participate in their program; and

"Whereas there are 36 approved Georgia projects underway; and

"Whereas there is a total capital investment under these programs of \$9,124,954.88, which has created 3,425 new jobs; and

"Whereas there are, at the present time, 11 projects pending which will entail a total capital investment of \$18,955,253 and create 872 new jobs; and

"Whereas as a typical example of the benefits to be derived from these programs, Perling Industries, Inc., has located a plant in Darien, Ga., by virtue of an Area Redevelopment Administration loan of \$422,500 which has created 200 new jobs within this county; and

"Whereas an additional vocational training grant of \$80,165 has been made available in connection with this industry; and

"Whereas the many benefits to be derived from the expansion of the Area Redevelopment programs are readily available to the industrial and economic future of the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby urge each and every member of the Georgia congressional delegation to support the program and appropriations of the Area Redevelopment Administration now pending before Congress in order that said administration's program may be expanded to additional counties in the State of Georgia and the many benefits to be derived therefrom distributed therein; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit an appropriate copy of this resolution to each and every member of the Georgia congressional delegation."

In house: Read and adopted June 3, 1964.

GLENN W. ELLARD, Clerk.

In senate: Read and adopted June 5, 1964.

GEORGE D. STEWART, Secretary.

U.S. Policy in South Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1964

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial concerning U.S. policy in South Vietnam which appeared in the New York Times of June 12. With the increasing crisis in this area the New York Times has performed a welcomed service by its forthright presentation of the issue. I urge all my colleagues to read the following editorial:

ASIAN CONFRONTATION

Two U.S. planes have been shot down in Laos and now American armed fighter plane escorts are shooting back. The situation is deteriorating in Vietnam as well as in Laos and, by reflexion, in Cambodia, Thailand, and all of southeast Asia. When or how is the shooting going to end? When or how is the steady, if slow, advance of the Communists in the region going to be stopped?

The power factor in southeast Asia that really counts is the confrontation between the United States and Communist China. They are still at some distance from each other, but the gap is closing. When Under Secretary Ball and President de Gaulle conferred the other day, they agreed that southeast Asia should be denied to the Communists, but they disagreed on how this goal was to be achieved.

General de Gaulle insists with reason that no settlement of the Indochina conflict is possible without the concurrence of the